REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 have been amended to indicate the origin of the third message is from among the monitored messages and that the correlation or correlator is used or responsive to the identification related to an end-user of the data item and the call identifier in the selected third messages. In addition, a typographical error in claim 15 has been rectified and an irrelevant clause having no antecedent basis has been removed from claim 10. Entry of the amendment is in order because the amendment is directed only to formal matters and does not raise new issues or require a new search. In this regard, applicants note no art is applied against the claims.

Claim 8 is written to include the subject matter inadvertently omitted in a prior response, but was previously corrected when a response to Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was filed with the USPTO so that after the word "and" before the final clause the phrase "establishing a correlation between first and second messages for which the elapsed time is below a predetermined threshold, and thus between the first and" has been inserted. These words are not underlined because they are not newly added.

Attorney for applicant acknowledges the telephone conferences he had on Sept. 10, 2004 with Examiner Kading concerning the rejection of claims 1-14 based on 35 USC 112, paragraph 1. Examiner Kading expressed his opinion that the disclosure was inadequate because the description on page 6, lines 10-16 did not adequately describe the way (1) the calling and called address parameters are combined to obtain the correlation of the message on link 22 between media gateway controllers (MGCs) 10 and 10a with the SS7 ISUP message on bearer channel 18; (2) the session description protocol (SDP) connection description parameter included in the initial address message (IAM) on link 22 between MGCs 10 and 10a is correlated with the OK message from media gateway (MG) 12 to MGC

7

10 on link 26, and (3) the OK message from MG 12 to MGC 10 on link 26 is correlated with the CRCX message from MGC 10 to MG 12 on link 26. Examiner Kading said that while he is familiar with the communications art in general, he is not well versed in the very specific technology to which the present invention relates.

Applicant replies to the opinion expressed by Examiner Kading concerning the description on page 6, lines 10-16 by saying those of ordinary skill in the very specific technology to which the present invention relates would have known how to derive these correlations.

To obtain the correlation described previously in connection with item (1), one of ordinary skill would understand this merely involves a comparison of pairs of values. To obtain the correlation, the calling and called address parameters (on one hand) of the MGC IAM are combined with those of (on the other hand) the SS7 IAM. The word combination in this case merely involves the concatenation of the two address parameters. For example, in the case of a phone call, the address parameters are phone numbers. Hence, for example, if a first person at phone number 44118974302 were to call a second person at phone number 017036841111, the calling parameter would be 44118974302 and the called parameter would be 017036841111. The IAMs that would be correlated therefore both have combined parameters of 4411892748302-017036841111. The recognition that both IAMs have the same value of combined or concatenated parameters enables them to be correlated. The fact that IAMs have address parameters of this type (i.e., phone numbers in the foregoing example) and the basic action of comparing the values of the calling and called phone numbers to recognize IAMs relating to the same call to obtain the correlation is well-known to those of ordinary skill in this art.

To obtain the correlation described previously in connection with item (2), one of ordinary skill would understand this merely involves associating the SDP connection description parameter in the MGC IAMs and MGCP OK messages. This connection

8

description typically comprises the combination (concatenation) of a network type (such as IN), an address type (such as IP4), and an IP address, such as 123.231.132.213. Consequently, MGC IAMs and MGCP OK messages would both have the same value of the SDP connection description parameter: IN IP4 123.231.132.213. The format of this parameter is spelled out in the IETF RFC (= "standard") 2327 (Session Description Protocol). Because the MGC IAMs and MGCP OK messages would both have the same value of the SDP connection description parameter, correlating the MGC IAMs and MGCP OK messages merely involves making sure both messages have the same value of the SDP connection description parameter, as was well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was filed.

To obtain the correlation described previously in connection with item (3), one of ordinary skill would understand this merely involves associating the transaction identification included in both the MGCP OK and the MGCP CRCX messages. The transaction identification identifies a transaction and has the same value in two messages that both relate to the same transaction. A transaction identification is simply a number between zero and 999,999,999. Those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was filed were well aware that the correlation is obtained by determining if the identifications included in the MGCP OK and the MGCP CRCX messages are the same.

The existence and format of these various parameters are defined in international and/or industry standards. Their existence and use (by comparing values) to recognize a transaction to which the message relates was, at the time the application was filed, well-known to those of ordinary skill in the art. These parameters are often included precisely to enable identification of some aspect of a transaction. These operations, in themselves, are so fundamental and commonplace in this art, that it is not necessary to spell them out to those of ordinary skill in the art. Any person of ordinary skill in the art who was told, at the time the application was filed, that two messages of the type discussed in the application can be correlated by reference to the identified parameter would have understood that such a correlation means determining if the value of that parameter is same in both messages.

9

Applicant notes that the European Patent Office, which examines applications to determine if they have an enabling disclosure to those skilled in the art, granted the corresponding European patent (EP 1,093,312). No question with respect to the disclosure was raised by the European Patent Office.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested and deemed in order.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP

Randy A. Noranbrock, Registration No. 42,490
For Allan M. Lowe, Registration No. 19,641

USPTO Customer No. 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: September 14, 2004
AML/PJC

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMI-
TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW

Pamela C
TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION

SIGNATURE   09/14/2004 DATE

703 872 9306
FACSIMILE NUMBER

10